



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/939,965 | 08/27/2001 | Kevin O'Rourke | 2001P07803US01 | 5436 |
| 7590 | 07/01/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| Elsa Keller Legal Assistant, Intl Prop Dept. SIEMENS CORPORATION 186 Wood Avenue South Iselin, NJ 08830 | | | VEILLARD, JACQUES | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2165 | |
| DATE MAILED: 07/01/2005 | | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/939,965 | O'ROURKE, KEVIN | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Jacques Veillard | 2165 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/8/2005.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the applicant's amendment filed on 4/8/2005.
2. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 17, and 18 have been amended.
3. Claims 1-20 are pending and presented for examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 4/8/2005 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, it has been placed in the application file. The information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20, filed on 4/8/2005, have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de la Huerga et al. U. S. Pat. No. 5,903,889 in view of Bessette (U. S. Pat. No. 6,775,670).

As per claim 1, de la Huerga et al. disclose a “system and method for translating collecting and archiving patient records” by providing a collecting data records having a plurality of formats and distributed on a plurality of databases on a computer network (See de la Huerga et al. title and abstract). In particular, de la Huerga et al. disclose the claimed limitations of “receiving user entered information identifying at least one patient record to be acquired and a particular section of a patient record to be acquired” by providing a data translation and collection system for receive data record from a database (See de la Huerga et al. Fig. 13A, step 640, col.4, lines 40-42, col.7, lines 26-31, col.9, lines 31-36, and col.10, lines 26-28). Also, de la Huerga et al. disclose the claimed limitations of “generating a URL link for accessing a patient record repository, said generated URL link including an address of said repository and containing fields incorporating said information identifying said particular section of said patient record and said patient record” by providing a URL cipher used to generate an address to store the designated type of data (See de la Huerga et al. col.7, lines 15-17, col.8, lines 41-64, col.9, line 55 through col.10, line 17, lines 43-59).

de la Huerga et al. did not expressly show communicating said generated URL link to an application used for accessing said repository; and receiving said identified particular patient record section in response to said communication.

However, this difference is only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and is not functionally involved in the steps recited. The communicating step would be performed the same regardless of the URL link. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see in re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the Applicant's invention was made to communicate the generated URL link, taught by de la Huerga et al., to an application used for accessing a repository; and receiving an identified particular patient record section having any type of content in response to the communication, because such communicating does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the communicating does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Furthermore, even though de La Huega et al. disclose the limitation of receiving configuration information, it noted, however, de La Huega et al. did not specifically disclose the claimed limitations determining at least one of, (a) a URL of a patient record repository, (b) a proxy server address, (c) user logon information, (d) list of patient to be accessed, (e) content type of patient record and (f) format of a patient record. On the other hand, Bessette achieved this claimed feature by providing a network system for storage medical records containing information of medical nature for the certain individual, and a plurality of pointers providing addresses or remote locations where reside other medical data for a particular individual (See Bessette Abstract, col.3, lines 31-61) wherein the record also contains one or more pointers, where these pointers use the URL addressing system in order to point to remote sites holding files that contain information in digitized form pertinent to the individual. Each pointer provides an address that is machine readable to import the data residing at the target location (See Bessette col., line 62 through col.4, line 21), and col.8, lines 3-22).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention was made to combine the teachings of de La Huega et al. with the

Art Unit: 2165

teachings of Bessette by incorporating a proxy server mechanism as taught by Bessette. The motivation being to have enhanced the system of de La Huega by allowing it to permit doctors to sit down at a workstation and log onto the server in order to request a patient's record from the server and read the pertinent information found in the record and analyze the patient data record quickly and efficiently (See Bessette col.8, lines 3-16).

As per claim 2, most of the claimed limitations have been noted in the rejection of claim

1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the combination of de la Huerga et al. and Bessette, as combined, discloses the claimed limitations of wherein said particular section of said patient record is associated with a particular type of patient medical data and said receiving activity also includes, "receiving information identifying a desired format for said patient record to be acquired" (See de la Huerga et al. col.2, lines 51-55, and line 65 through col.3, line29, and col.7, lines 19-57).

As per claim 3, most of the claimed limitations have been noted in the rejection of claim

1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the combination of de la Huerga et al. and Bessette, as combined, discloses the claimed limitations of "receiving a patient record content index and said activity of receiving user entered information identifying at least one record to be acquired and a particular section of patient record to be acquired is performed in response user selection of an item in said selection record content index (See de La Huega et al. (See col.13, lines 31-51, and col.14, lines 12-14)

As per claim 4, most of the claimed limitations have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the combination of de la Huerga et al. and Bessette, as combined, discloses the claimed limitations of "generating a notification indication for display to a user indicating said identified particular patient record section has been received" (See de la Huerga et al. col.11, lines 54-62).

As per claim 5, most of the claimed limitations have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the combination of de la Huerga et al. and Bessette, as combined, discloses the claimed limitations of "wherein said received particular patient record section comprises HTML web page representative information" (See de la Huerga et al. Figs. 6A, 7A, 8A, 9A, and col.5, lines 30-33, lines 36-38, lines 42-44, lines 49-51).

As per claim 6, most of the claimed limitations have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the combination of de la Huerga et al. and Bessette, as combined, discloses the claimed limitations of "searching said patient record repository to locate said identified particular patient record section" (See de la Huerga et al. Fig.15A steps 804 and 820, col.7, line 64 through col.8, line16, and col.11, lines50-53). Therefore, it is rejected on similar grounds corresponding to the arguments given for the rejected claim 1 above.

As per claim 17, most of the claimed limitations have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the combination of de la Huerga et al. and Bessette, as combined, discloses the claimed limitations of "updated patient record information and patient record section identification information; and storing said updated patient record information in a record section identified by said patient record section identification information" by modify the patient records using the URL cipher (See de la Huerga et al. col.3, lines 44-50, col.4, lines 17-20, Fig.12B step 596 and col.8, lines 57-61, Fig.13B and col.10, lines 10-14). Therefore, it is rejected on similar grounds corresponding to the arguments given for the rejected claim 1 above.

7. Claims 7-16 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de la Huerga et al. U. S. Pat. No. 5,903,889 in view of Frid et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 5,857,967).

As per claims 7 and 18, de la Huerga et al. disclose a "system and method for translating collecting and archiving patient records" by providing a collecting data records having a plurality of formats and distributed on a plurality of databases on a computer network (See de la Huerga et al. title and abstract). In particular, de la Huerga et al. disclose also the system "for providing updated patient record information to a patient record information repository" by modify the patient records using the URL cipher (See de la Huerga et al. col.3, lines 44-50, col.4, lines 17-20, Fig.12B step 596 and col.8, lines 57-61, Fig.13B and col.10, lines 10-14). Further, de la Huerga et al. disclose the claimed limitations of "generating a URL link including an address of said repository and containing fields incorporating said updated patient record information and information identifying a particular patient record section and said patient record" by providing a

URL cipher used to generate an address to store the designated type of data (See de la Huerga et al. col.7, lines 15-17, col.8, lines 41-64, col.9, line 55 through col.10, line 17, lines 43-59).

Furthermore, de la Huerga et al. use an interactive display program to display the communicating said updated patient record information to said information repository at said address using said generated URL link in response to user selection of a displayed menu icon (See de la Huerga et al. col.2, line 43 through col.3, line18, and col.11, lines 6-13).

Even though, de la Huerga et al. disclose a system relates to a computer for retrieving, modifying, and storing a plurality topically, textually related data records of a plurality of formats on a plurality databases in conformance with a hypertext-linked. It is noted, however, de la Huerga et al. did not specifically disclose the system for initiating display of a data collection page for collecting data of a patient associated with a particular patient record selection; storing updated patient record information acquired by user data entry via said data collection page. On the other hand, Frid et al. achieved this claimed features by providing a universally accessible healthcare devices with on the fly generation of HTML files which allows authorized healthcare providers to display data on a page (See Frid et al. title, abstract, Fig.2, col.2, lines 48-50, col.4, lines 38-49, col.5, lines 24-43, and col.6, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the of the Applicant's invention to modify the system and method for translating, collecting and archiving patient records of de la Huerga et al. by the universally accessible healthcare devices with on the fly generation of HTML files taught by Frid et al. because Frid et al. provide a system having a communication path which provides access to the medical information using an open standard network protocol wherein HTML files may be generated on the fly in response to an HTTP

command from a requesting web client in order to display the medical information of patient on a web page (See Frid et al. Fig.2 and col.5, lines 1-39).

As per claim 8, most of the claimed limitations have been noted in the rejection of claim 7. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 7 above. In addition, the combination of de la Huerga et al. and Frid et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of "receiving a patient medical record content index identifying the particular patient record section (See col.13, lines 31-51, and col.14, lines 12-14), and wherein said activity of communicating said updated patient record information comprises communicating said updated patient record section information via said URL data field to said information repository" (See Frid et al. col.2, lines 61-67).

As per claims 9 and 19, the combination of de la Huerga et al. and Frid et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of "including the activity of identifying updated patient record information different from information previously communicated to said information repository; and wherein said activity of communicating said updated patient record information comprises communicating said different updated patient record information via said URL data field to said information repository" (See Frid et al. col.3, line 64 through col.4, line 13).

As per claim 10, most of the claimed limitations have been noted in the rejection of claim 7. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 7 above. In addition, the combination

of de la Huerga et al. and Frid et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein said data collection page comprises an HTML page” (See Frid et al. Fig.2 and col.5, lines 24-29).

As per claims 11,12, 13, and 20, most of the claimed limitations have been noted in the rejection of claims 7 and 18. Applicant’s attention is directed to the rejection of claims 7 and 18 above. In addition, the combination of de la Huerga et al. and Frid et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of including the activity of time-stamping updated patient record section information acquired by user data entry via said data collection page, storing time-stamped updated patient record section information, and communicating said time-stamped updated patient record section information (See Frid et al. col.4, lines 14-25, Fig.2, and col.5, lines 30-33).

As per claim 14, most of the claimed limitations have been noted in the rejection of claim 7. Applicant’s attention is directed to the rejection of claim 7 above. In addition, the combination of de la Huerga et al. and Frid et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “including the activity of communicating said identified updated data collection page by Email to a remote application in response to user selection of a displayed menu icon” (See de la Huerga et al. col.11, lines 54-62).

As per claims 15 and 16, most of the claimed limitations have been noted in the rejection of claim 7. Applicant’s attention is directed to the rejection of claim 7 above. In addition, the combination of de la Huerga et al. and Frid et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “including the activity of providing a menu supporting user customization of a data collection

page for a particular patient" (See de la Huerga et al. Figs 6A, 7A, 8A, 9A, 14D and corresponding text).

Other Prior Art Made Of Record

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| 8. Seliger et al. | U. S. Pat. No. 5,546,580, |
| Rensimer et al. | U. S. Pat. No. 5,845,253, |
| Johnson et al. | U. S. Pat. No. 5,664,109, and |
| Felsher | U. S. Pub. No. 2002/0010679. |

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2165

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacques Veillard whose telephone number is (571) 272-4086. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Fri. from 9 AM to 4:30 PM, alt. Fri. off..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on (571) 272- 4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



**CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

J.V
Jacques Veillard
Patent Examiner TC 2100

June 24, 2005